

fiber yarns with adhesive, and

a plurality of said braiding yarns being [put together and] braided together.

REMARKS

Claim 2 is presently pending, with claims 1, 3-11, 13, 14 and 16-29 being withdrawn from further consideration in this application.

Claim 2 has been rejected as unpatentable under 35 USC 103 over Ueda et al in view of Ogino et al, and further over DeWitt, Sr. in view of Schnitzler, and over Case et al in view of Schnitzler. These rejections have been carefully considered but are not believed to include a sufficient teaching which would render claim 2 unpatentable under 35 USC 103.

In reviewing these references, it has been noted that none of these references teach a packing which is made up of internally reinforced braiding yarns. Consider specifically the Ueda et al patent which discloses a packing made up of flexible graphite sheets 1 which are "less than 1mm in thickness and less than 5mm in width." These sheets 1 are surrounded "with knitted Aramid fiber or nickel-chromium-iron alloy fiber." This arrangement comprises an "externally-reinforced yarn." According to the present invention, the packing is made up of internally reinforced braiding yarns, i.e., yarns that comprise reinforcing fiber yarns arranged in parallel which are held together by expanded graphite bonded to the reinforcing fiber yarns by adhesive. This arrangement is not at all the same as the yarn

disclosed in Ueda et al, or any of the other references of record.

Both Ogino and Schitzler relate to a mold packing which is obtained by placing an expanded graphite tape or an expanded graphite corrugated ribbon in a mold and then conducting a pressure molding process. Expanded graphite is flexible but at the same time very brittle, and the only way to produce a packing with such a material is by mold packing. Mold packing can only be formed into a particular annular shape. This is quite unlike the present invention where any desired shape can be produced.

Claim 2 has been amended to reflect the distinction noted above, and not found in the references of record.

In view of the foregoing, the examiner is urged to enter the present amendment to claim 2, to reconsider his position and advance a finding that claim 2 is allowed over the art of record. Alternatively, the examiner is urged to enter the present amendment to claim 2 for purposes of appeal.

Respectfully submitted,



Felix J. D'Ambrosio
Reg. No. 25,721

November 6, 1995
P.O. Box 2266 Eads Station
Arlington, VA 22202
Tel: (703) 415-1500
Fax: (703) 415-1508